

## REMARKS

Claim 2 above, which the examiner has deemed acceptable in form, but not in novelty, is presented again.

### **Amended Claims**

The OA pointed out that, in cancelled claims 9-14, the phrase “further comprising entering an offer” was indefinite. The OA asked for clarification. Accordingly, applicant submits amended claims 15-21 that do not include this phrase. The phrase is deleted from the prior, now cancelled, claims.

With this phrase deleted, the dependent claims have a definite and clear relationship to the offer process defined in independent claim 2.

The OA also pointed out that cancelled claim 9 used the phrase, “said purchase not necessarily being from said advertiser,” and pointed out that this phrasing could allow for various interpretations, some of which could potentially be equivalent to a conventional coupon process. New claim 15 retains this phrase.

Applicant also submits amended claim 16, which changes the phrase above to, “said purchase necessarily being from a competitor of said advertiser.” In this phrase the potential ambiguity above is eliminated. Claim 24 mirrors claim 16.

As defined in claims 16 and 24, the invention enables an advertiser to pay for the attention of a sales prospect, but the payment is only valid if the prospect buys from a direct competitor of the advertiser. If the prospect buys from the advertiser, the payment of money is blocked. For instance, say Microsoft gives an EV payment to a prospect for reading an article about its operating system, and that the payment is only valid if the prospect buys from, say, Apple. Then,

if the prospect buys an operating system from Microsoft, the prospect can't collect any money via the invention.

Claim 20 amends cancelled claim 13, substituting possibly more grammatical wording for the term "who" and reflecting the specification (pages 105-106). There is no intent to change the meaning of or restrict the claim.

### **Support in the Specification**


These claims find support throughout the specification of application 10/042,975. In particular, Book II of the specification is devoted to disclosing methods for targeting and paying "realbuyer" prospects: see pages 65-66 which discuss the purposes of these methods, and pages 96-109 which disclose sub-methods reflected in dependent claims 15-21 and 22-29. The apparatus claims find support throughout the specification, e.g., at pages 9 and 10.

### **Prior Art and Novelty**

Applicant stands by his assertions of novelty made in his request for continuing examination of this application.

Examiner indicated in an interview in a previous round of examination that the invention defined by claim 16 and/or claim 24 could be novel.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael T. Rossides", written in a cursive style.

Michael T. Rossides

602-295-4967